DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 982 UD 027 495

AUTHOR Stanley, Cheryl
TITLE Magnet Schools. Fourteenth Annual Final Report, 1988-89.
INSTITUTION Houston Independent School District, TX. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 48p.; For earlier report, see UD 027 494.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Busing; Class Size; Compliance (Legal); Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure per Student; *Magnet Schools; Minority Group Children; *Racial Composition; Racial Integration; *School Desegregation; Teacher Student Ratio; Teaching Experience; Urban Education; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Houston Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the success of the magnet school program in the Houston (Texas) Independent School District for the 1988-89 school year. The following sections are included: (1) "Overview of the District"; (2) "History of Desegregation in Houston"; (3) "Development of Houston's Magnet School Program"; (4) "Objectives Related to the Court Order"; and (5) "Information Required by the Settlement Agreement." Achievement of the following objectives is discussed: (1) reduction in the number of schools that are 90 percent or more White or combined Black and Hispanic; (2) reduction in the number of students attending schools that are 90 percent or more White or combined Black and Hispanic; (3) free transportation upon request to all students attending magnet schools outside their attendance zone; and (4) reports of student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group. This report provides the following information for each magnet school as required by the Settlement Agreement: (1) race or ethnicity; (2) per pupil expenditure; (3) achievement scores; (4) average class size; (5) student/teacher ratio; (6) teacher experience; and (7) waiting lists. The following findings are presented: (1) the number of ethnically isolated schools increased; (2) the number of students attending ethnically isolated schools was reduced; (3) 16,587 students were transported over the 1-year period for the purpose of desegregation; and (4) a total of 98,163 students were affected by magnet school programs. Twenty-two tables are included. A list of the magnet schools is appended. (JS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Cathy Mincberg, President
Melody Ellis, Vice-President
Olga Gallegos, Secretary
Wiley E. Henry, Assistant Secretary
Paula Arnold
Felix Fraga
Ron Franklin
Don McAdams
Rod Paige

Magnet Schools
Fourteenth Annual Final Report
1988–89

Prepared by
Cheryl Stanley, Director
Administrative Research Bureau

Dr. Kathryn Sanchez, Assistant Superintendent
Department of Research and Evaluation
Houston Independent School District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Overview of the District 1

History of Desegregation in Houston 1

Development of Houston's Magnet School Program 2

Objectives Related to the Court Order 5

- Objective 1 5
- Objective 2 10
- Objective 3 14
- Objective 4 15

Information Required by the Settlement Agreement 26

Appendix 38

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1
Number and Percent of One-Race Schools by School Level from 1974–75 to 1987–88 6

Table 2
Number of One-Race Schools for 1987–88 by Race and Ethnicity and by Level 7

Table 3
One-Race Minority Elementary Magnet School Campuses, 1987-88 8

Table 4
One-Race Minority Secondary Magnet School Campuses, 1987–88 8

Table 5
One-Race Magnet Schools from 1983-84 to 1988-89 9

Table 6
District Enrollment and Ethnic Percentages, 1974–75 to 1987–88 11

Table 8
Percentage of Students Attending One-Race Schools, 1974–75 to 1988–89 13

Table 9
Final Student Enrollment for Add-On (AOP) Magnet Programs, May 1989 16

Table 10
Final Student Enrollment for School-Within-a-School (SWAS) Magnet Programs, May 1989 17

Table 11
Final Student Enrollment for Separate and Unique (SUS) Magnet Schools, May 1989 19

Table 12
Final Student Participation for Cluster Center Magnet Programs, May 1989 19

Table 13
Final Student Enrollment in All Magnet Programs, May 1989 20

Table 14
SWAS Magnet Programs That Met Their Total Enrollment Goals, May 1989 22

Table 15
SWAS Magnet Programs That Were ±5% of the Ethnic and Racial Goals, May 1989 23

Table 16
Percentages of White Enrollment at AOP Magnet Schools, May 1988 and May 1989 24

Table 17
Percentages of White Enrollment at Separate and Unique Magnet Schools in May 1988 and May 1989 25

Table 18
Student/Teacher Ratio and Teacher Experience by Magnet School, 1988–89 26

Table 19
The Number of Verbal Denials In-District (HISD) and Out-of-District (non-HISD) by Race and Ethnicity, 1988–89 28

Table 20
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6) Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests by Magnet Program, Spring 1989 31

Table 21
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6) Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests for Specialty Groupings, Spring 1989 35

Table 22
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Spring 1989 35

Magnet Schools
Executive Summary
Fourteenth Annual Report
1988–89

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Magnet schools offer a special or enhanced curriculum to attract students districtwide within a specified ethnic ratio.

A total of 83 alternative educational programs have been established and operated during the 1988–89 school year. The 83 programs, located on 76 campuses, represent all grade levels, pre-kindergarten through 12, and range from fine arts to math/science, to extended instructional day, to gifted and talented.

This Magnet School Evaluation addresses the four objectives of the Magnet School Plan and provides information by Magnet school as required by the Settlement Agreement.

FINDINGS

Objectives Related to the Court Order

1. Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

The number of ethnically isolated schools for 1988–89 was 125 as compared to 117 during the baseline year of 1974–75.

2. Reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

During the baseline year of 1974–75, 54.1% of the students in the district attended ethnically isolated schools. This past year only 48.1% were in this category.

3. Provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet Schools outside their regular school attendance zone.

The Transportation Department reported transporting a total of 16,587 students for desegregation purposes this year. This total includes majority-to-minority transfer students. In addition, 972 transportation agreements were issued.

4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet School biannually.

A total of 98,163 students were affected directly or indirectly by Magnet school programs. Total full-time enrollment in Magnet school programs was 31,643 students. The overall makeup of the Magnet school student population including participants of cluster centers was 34% Black, 32% Hispanic and 34% White. Excluding cluster center participants, the ethnic makeup was 40% Black, 26% Hispanic and 34% White. Considering all students who benefitted from lowered student/teacher ratios and additional staff, the total number of students impacted by the Magnet School Program was 51.2% of the district's total enrollment. The district provides teacher assignment by ethnic group as part of the 1988–89 Annual Report, Settlement Agreement.

Information Required by the Settlement Agreement

The Settlement Agreement requires the following to be reported for each Magnet program and location: per pupil expenditure, race or ethnicity, achievement scores, average class size, student/teacher ratio, teacher experience and waiting lists. Average class size, per pupil expenditure, waiting lists, and student/professional staff ratio were not available this year.

Race or ethnicity — Of the 56 school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs, 39 met enrollment goals and 24 met ethnic goals. Of the 27 add-on programs (AOP) and separate and unique schools (SUS), 14 met ethnic goals.

Achievement scores — Overall, Magnet students in grades 1 through 8 scored at or above grade level on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6). A majority of the Magnet students passed each subtest of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS).

Student/teacher ratio — The elementary figure represents the ratio of students (excluding special education students in self-contained special education classes) to all regularly assigned classroom teachers. Teachers excluded are pull-out program teachers, special education teachers and all federally funded teachers. For secondary schools, the figure represents the ratio of students (excluding special education students in self-contained special education classes) to all teaching staff excluding self-contained special education teachers. The ratio on elementary Magnet campuses ranges from 18.3 to 23.9 and on secondary Magnet campuses from 12.1 to 22.1.

Teacher experience — On Magnet campuses, the percent of teachers with over 10 years of experience ranged from 24% to 70%.

Verbal Denials — The number of students verbally denied admittance to a Magnet program because no vacancies existed ranged from 0 to 232.

MAGNET SCHOOLS
FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT
1988–89

This report presents information regarding the achievement of the four objectives established by the Court Order which approved the implementation of Magnet schools in July, 1975. It also provides information required by the Settlement Agreement which ended the district's twenty-eight year old desegregation lawsuit.

Individual Magnet programs are evaluated using campus-based objectives. Final audits of program objectives are submitted to and reviewed by the Magnet evaluator.

The Magnet school programs, with their specialties, are listed in the appendix.

OVERVIEW OF THE DISTRICT

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) is the sixth largest school district in the United States, and it is the largest district in the South. It is located in southeast Texas in a region referred to as the Upper Texas Gulf Coastal Plain, about fifty miles northwest of the Port of Galveston on the Gulf of Mexico. The Houston Independent School District consists of 312 square miles which occupy the center of both the City of Houston and Harris County. The district has a student enrollment of approximately 190,381 which includes special service schools and is truly multi-ethnic. It is 0.1% American Indian, 2.7% Asian, 40.9% Black, 40.8% Hispanic and 15.5% White. The Houston Independent School District, one of 20 school districts in Harris County, includes 37.4% of the total public school enrollment of 509,072 in Harris County (see Table 7).

HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION IN HOUSTON

Prior to the United States Supreme Court decisions in Brown vs. The Board of Education, the Houston Independent School District existed as a dual school system, that is, there were specific schools reserved for Black and White students. Following the Brown I and II rulings, HISD went through a series of desegregation activities similar to those of most other southern school systems. The most recent of these activities has been an extensive Magnet School Plan.

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) began school desegregation in the fall of 1960 when it implemented a grade per year transfer plan. Subsequently, the district has been engaged in other

methods to achieve integration, e.g., freedom of choice (1967), and school pairing (1971). None of these methods achieved the desired results.

An indication of this failure can be seen in enrollment patterns under the 1971 pairing plan. When twenty-two schools in the Houston Independent School District were paired in September of 1971, the enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 16,733. By 1975, enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 15,419. Enrollment in the total district at the time of pairing was 231,922. The enrollment of students in Houston schools as of February 1, 1975, was 210,117.

Pairing did not promote integration. The pairing of schools affected 9,957 Black students, 4,923 Hispanic students, and 539 White students. Hispanic students were counted as "White." This classification implied that minority students were paired with majority students. In reality, minority students (Black) were paired with minority students (Hispanic).

The HISD Magnet School Program, Phase I, was formally implemented with the beginning of the 1975–76 school year in compliance with the Amended Decree of September 18, 1970, by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. This amended action, designated Civil Action No. 10444, dated July 11, 1975, provided for the depairing of twenty-two (22) elementary schools, the restoration of the paired schools' original equidistant zone lines, and the implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSTON'S MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Magnet School Program in Houston was the result of careful study and planning. It began with an action by the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District which established a Task Force on Quality Integrated Education. This task force, established in December, 1974, was directed to seek out and recommend an alternative, or alternatives, to forced school pairing as a desegregation method for the Houston Independent School District. They visited several cities with successful desegregation plans in operation. Not all of the cities visited used Magnet schools; in fact, very few of them did, but these few cities were those that the task force felt had the most exciting and truly successful plans for integrating students of different ethnic groups.

In February, 1975, the task force presented the Board with its initial recommendations. The primary recommendation was that the Houston Independent School District establish a network of alternative programs or "centers of excellence." These programs, by providing high quality instruction in special areas and the basic skills, would attract students from all ethnic groups and areas of the district, thereby creating quality education in integrated settings.

Soon after the task force made its initial recommendations, the Board of Trustees of the Hou Independent School District established an administrative support team to assist the task forc putting its recommendations into action. This support team, headed by an assistant superintend and made up of principals, counselors, and instructional specialists from throughout the district, charged with the responsibility of designing programs that would qualify as "centers of excelle and be economically feasible as well. The support team was to draw up initial program specificati objectives, action steps, and budgets and to establish procedures whereby personnel could be appoi to these programs and students could be recruited.

When the administrative support team had finished its work, it presented to the Board initial prog designs and installation budgets for approximately 40 Magnet programs. From these, on administration's recommendation, 32 programs were to be implemented during the 1975–76 sc year, with the remaining programs to begin the next year. The Board of Trustees then instructe legal representatives to present this new plan to the Federal District Court as an alternative to school pairing plan.

The Federal District Court heard the district's presentation on June 2, 1975. On July 12, 1975, Federal District Court approved substitution of the recommended Magnet School Program for district's school pairing plan. This adoption date gave the district five weeks to dismantle a pai plan involving 22 schools, assign and/or hire 32 Magnet school staffs at 29 different campu market the programs, and enroll students in the programs.

The Magnet School Plan as presented to the court and subsequently approved in July, 1975, included following four objectives:

1. Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black Hispanic.
2. Reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combi Black and Hispanic.
3. Provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet Schools out their regular school attendance zone.
4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet Sc biannually.

Six people (three field information coordinators, two Magnet school program administrators, and assistant superintendent) directed the implementation of the Magnet School Program. This inclu establishing new transportation routes to accommodate Magnet school transfer students.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cheryl Stanley
Houston Independent
School District

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In 1979, HISD petitioned the court to be declared unitary, that is, that no vestiges of a dual system remain. On September 28, 1979, the court directed the Texas Education Agency (TEA):

> to make a study identifying and evaluating the educational challenges faced by HISD and other urban school districts... (and)... to develop a plan to meet these challenges which will provide for the voluntary cooperation and sharing of educational opportunities, with the goal of educational enrichment for both urban and suburban students.

The court directed the TEA to file a report by April 1, 1980, and directed HISD to "provide the TEA with appropriate data and otherwise assist the TEA with the development of the study." On April 1, 1980, the TEA submitted a response, the Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan (VIEP). On July 17, 1980, the court received the "1980–81 Implementation Activities of the Plan Submitted by the Texas Education Agency." The HISD participates in the VIEP as the receiving district by enrolling students from surrounding districts in the Magnet schools.

A second Magnet School Task Force composed of community and HISD personnel began meeting in the fall of 1980 to determine needs for expansion or redirection of the Magnet Program in order to maximize integration efforts and better accommodate the VIEP. On June 17, 1981, Judge Robert O'Conor declared the Houston Independent School District unitary and retained jurisdiction of the case on the inactive docket for three years. On March 1, 1982, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) filed a request for oral argument in the process of appeals. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Judge O'Conor's ruling on February 16, 1983.

At the end of the three year period in the summer of 1984, a public hearing was held. A settlement agreement to remain in effect for a term of five (5) years, was signed on September 10, 1984, by the parties of the lawsuit. On November 26, 1984, Judge John V. Singleton approved an Order of Dismissal of the lawsuit and an Order Approving the Settlement Agreement.

The following section of this report will address the four objectives from the original court order.

OBJECTIVES RELATED TO THE COURT ORDER

Objective 1: HISD will reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

Racially Isolated Schools

The number of one-race schools in 1974–75 was 117. For 1988–89, the number of one-race schools districtwide, 115, has risen to the highest level since the baseline year. This can be attributed in part to the district's shifting racial and ethnic populations (see Tables 5 and 6).

In order to determine the degree to which this objective has been met, the number and percent of schools which were one-race (i.e., 90% or more White, Black, Hispanic or combined Black and Hispanic) during the last year of the school pairing plan (1974–75) must be compared to similar figures for Phase XIV (1988–89) of the Magnet School Plan. The Texas Education Agency Fall Membership Survey 1988–89 was used to prepare this section of the report. For purposes of desegregation, White is defined as all races that are not Black or Hispanic. Table 1 presents the data for the last year of school pairing, 1974–75, and for each of the fourteen years of implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

Table 1 includes all schools in the district except special education schools and programs. A special program school was not counted unless there was a separate principal for the program. Secondary schools with grades 7–12 were counted as one school if they were on a single campus with one principal.

Table 1
Number and Percent of One-Race Schools by School Level from 1974–75 to 1987–88

School Year	Elementary			Junior/Middle			Senior			All Schools		
	Total Schools	One-Race Schools		Total Schools	One-Race Schools		Total Schools	One-Race Schools		Total Schools	One-Race Schools	
		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%
1974–75 Baseline	170	87	51.2	31	16	51.6	29	4	8.3	230	117	50.9
1975–76	169	81	47.9	32	13	40.6	31	13	41.9	232	107	46.1
1976–77	169	78	46.2	31	12	38.7	32	12	37.5	232	102	44.0
1977–78	169	76	45.0	30	12	38.9	32	11	34.4	231	99	42.9
1978–79	170	79	46.5	31	13	41.9	32	11	34.4	233	103	44.2
1979–80	169	76	45.0	34	14	41.2	32	13	40.6	235	103	43.8
1980–81	168	81	48.2	34	14	41.2	31	12	38.7	233	107	45.9
1981–82	167	82	49.1	34	14	41.2	32	12	37.5	233	108	46.4
1982–83	167	79	47.3	34	14	41.2	32	13	40.6	233	106	45.5
1983–84	167	80	47.9	34	15	44.1	32	14	43.8	233	109	46.8
1984–85	166	81	48.8	34	15	44.1	32	14	43.8	232	110	47.4
1985–86	166	83	50.0	34	16	47.1	32	14	43.8	232	113	48.7
1986–87	166	83	50.0	34	16	47.1	32	15	46.9	232	114	49.1
1987–88	166	84	50.6	34	16	47.1	33	15	45.5	233	115	49.4
1988–89	167	91	54.5	34	18	52.9	32	16	50.0	233	125	53.6

The total number and percent of one-race schools increased by ten for 1988–89 as compared to 1987–88. This is the greatest increase in one-race schools since the Magnet Schools program began. The number and percent of one-race schools is at the highest level since the baseline year of 1974–75. The number and percent of one-race schools increased at every level this year compared to last year. All the one-race schools are one-race minority schools. There has not been a one-race White school since 1983–84.

Table 2 presents the number of one-race schools for 1988–89 by race and ethnicity and by level.

Table 2
Number of One-Race Schools for 1987–88 by Race and Ethnicity and by Level

	One-Race Black Schools (90% or More Black Enrollment)	One-Race Hispanic Schools (90% or More Hispanic Enrollment)	One-Race Minority Schools (90% or More Black and Hispanic Combined)		Total
			At least 45% Black	At least 45% Hispanic	
Elementary	31	22	23	15	91
Middle	6	2	7	3	18
Senior	5	1	8	2	16
Total	42	25	38	20	125

The number of one-race Black schools remained the same while one-race Hispanic schools increased by four. One-race minority schools where Black students are predominant increased by five, and predominantly Hispanic one-race minority schools increased by one. The total number of one-race schools for 1988-89 increased by ten.

Racially Isolated Magnet Schools

Of the 74 full-time Magnet school campuses (excluding Cluster Centers), ten elementary schools, four middle schools and eight high school Magnet campuses were classified as one-race minority schools using the 1988 TEA Fall Survey. This is an increase of two Magnet schools in the one-race category.

It should be noted that of the 21 one-race Magnet school campuses, 15 have Magnet programs which are school-within-a-school.

Of the 45 elementary Magnet school campuses (excluding Cluster Centers), ten were classified one-race minority schools, i.e., 90% or more minority enrollment. They are listed in Table 3. Of these ten, six are school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs and five are add-on programs (AOP) serving the total school. One school has both types of programs on the campus.

Table 3
One-Race Minority Elementary Magnet School Campuses, 1987–88

Berry (AOP)	Lantrip (SWAS)
Bruce (AOP)	Law (AOP)
Burrus (SWAS)	Lockhart (SWAS and AOP)
DeZavala (SWAS)	Pugh (AOP)
Anson Jones (SWAS)	Ross (SWAS)

Of the 29 secondary Magnet schools, eleven were classified one-race minority schools. These are listed in Table 4.

Table 4
One-Race Minority Secondary Magnet School Campuses, 1987–88

Austin (SWAS)	Fleming (SWAS)	Ryan (SWAS)
Contemporary Learning Center (CLC) High School (SUS)	Hartman (SWAS)	Sterling (SWAS)
	Jones (SWAS)	Washington (SWAS)
Davis (SWAS)	Jordan (SUS)	Yates (SWAS)

The Magnet schools classified as one-race have varied somewhat over the last few years. Table 5 presents the Magnet schools which have been one-race schools at one time from 1983-84 to 1988-89. Bold lettering indicates that the school had a Magnet program that year.

Table 5
One-Race Magnet Schools from 1983-84 to 1988-89

1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
ELEMENTARY					
	Berry (AOP)	**Berry**	**Berry**	**Berry**	**Berry**
				Bruce (AOP)	**Bruce**
Burrus (SWAS)	**Burrus**	**Burrus**	**Burrus**	**Burrus**	**Burrus**
Codwell (AOP)					
DeZavala	DeZavala	DeZavala	DeZavala	**DeZavala** (SWAS)	**DeZavala**
Dow	**Dow** (SWAS)	**Dow**		**Dow**	
			Jones, A (SWAS)	**Jones, A**	**Jones, A**
Lantrip (SWAS)	**Lantrip**	**Lantrip**	**Lantrip**	**Lantrip**	**Lantrip**
Law	Law	Law	**Law** (AOP)	**Law**	**Law**
Lockhart	**Lockhart** (SWAS & AOP)	**Lockhart**	**Lockhart**	**Lockhart**	**Lockhart**
	Pugh (AOP)	**Pugh**	**Pugh**	**Pugh**	**Pugh**
Ross (SWAS)	**Ross**	**Ross**	**Ross**	**Ross**	**Ross**
	Travis	Travis	Travis		
Whidby (SWAS)		**Whidby**			
MIDDLE					
					CLC Mid (SUS)
Fleming (SWAS)	**Fleming**	**Fleming**	**Fleming**	**Fleming**	**Fleming**
					Hartman (SWAS)
Ryan	Ryan	Ryan	Ryan	**Ryan** (SWAS)	**Ryan**
SENIOR					
Austin	Austin	**Austin** (SWAS)	**Austin**	**Austin**	**Austin**
					CLC Sr (SUS)
Davis (SWAS)	**Davis**	**Davis**	**Davis**	**Davis**	**Davis**
Jones (SWAS)	**Jones**	**Jones**	**Jones**	**Jones**	**Jones**
Jordan (SUS)	**Jordan**	**Jordan**	**Jordan**	**Jordan**	**Jordan**
Sterling (SWAS)	**Sterling**	**Sterling**	**Sterling**	**Sterling**	**Sterling**
Washington (SWAS)	**Washington**	**Washington**	**Washington**	**Washington**	**Washington**
Yates (SWAS)	**Yates**	**Yates**	**Yates**	**Yates**	**Yates**

Objective 2: HISD will reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

Reviewing the data for the past fifteen years shows that in the latter half of the 1970's, the first years after implementation of the Magnet school program, significant impact on integration was evident in terms of reducing the number of one-race schools and reducing the number of students attending one-race schools. The number of one race schools declined from 117 (50% of all schools) in 1974–75 to 103 (43% of all schools) in 1979–80, while the number of students attending one-race schools declined from 54% of the student population in 1974–75 to a low of 45% in 1978-79. Since that time the percentage of students in one-race schools has remained almost constant (48% in 1988–89) while the number and percent of schools that are one-race has slowly increased almost to the baseline level (115 schools or 49% in 1987–88) and substantially surpassed the baseline level (125) in 1988-89. The latter phenomenon is most probably a function of the constantly declining enrollment, especially of White students, changing previously integrated schools into one-race minority, as well as the declining enrollment in traditionally black schools, which remain one-race but contribute fewer students to the one-race category. The increase in the Hispanic population has made an impact on one-race schools as well. A dramatic increase in the district's White enrollment will be needed to substantially increase integration throughout the district. As long as the number and percent of White students continues to decline, the number of one-race schools and the number of students attending one-race schools will continue to increase.

In 1974–75, 114,143 students or 54.1% attended one-race schools. The October 1988 TEA Fall Membership Survey indicates that 91,632 students, or 48.1%, attended one-race schools in 1988–89, an increase of 4,584 students from the 87,048 students who attended one-race schools in 1987–88. District enrollment has changed in the last ten years; therefore, examination of the district's enrollment and the percentage of students in one-race schools is more meaningful. The district enrollment and ethnic percentages are provided in Table 6.

Table 6
District Enrollment and Ethnic Percentages, 1974–75 to 1987–88

	Black		Hispanic		Asian		White/Am. Ind.		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1974–75 Baseline	88,804	42.0	40,227	19.0	845	0.4	81,698	38.6	211,574
1975–76	90,034	42.6	42,962	20.3	1,014	0.5	77,398	36.6	211,408
1976–77	90,635	43.2	45,743	21.8	1,702	0.8	71,945	34.3	210,025
1977–78	91,157	44.0	47,128	22.8	2,194	1.1	66,519	32.1	206,998
1978–79	90,872	45.0	48,877	24.2	2,730	1.4	59,481	29.5	201,960
1979–80	87,797	45.3	49,639	25.6	3,253	1.7	53,217	27.4	193,906
1980–81	87,102	44.9	53,917	27.8	4,095	2.1	48,929	25.2	194,043
1981–82	85,834	44.3	57,558	29.7	5,103	2.6	45,207	23.3	193,702
1982–83	85,679	44.1	60,193	31.0	6,269	3.2	42,298	21.8	194,439
1983–84	83,592	44.1	61,424	32.4	5,824	3.1	38,627	20.4	189,467
1984–85	81,493	43.6	63,950	34.2	5,843	3.1	35,745	19.1	187,031
1985–86	83,423	43.0	69,874	36.0	6,352	3.3	34,240	17.7	193,889
1986–87	82,763	42.5	72,856	37.4	5,883	3.0	33,065	17.0	194,567
1987–88	80,274	41.8	74,608	38.9	5,477	2.9	31,472	16.4	191,831
1988–89	77,828	40.9	77,701	40.8	5,129	2.7	29,723	15.6	190,381

The figures in Table 6 were taken directly from the TEA Fall Membership Surveys of each year. The numbers shown represent all students enrolled in the district, including special education students.

Since 1975–76 the district enrollment decreased steadily for ten years. The number and percentage of White students has continued to decrease since 1974–75 to the present. Presently, only 13.3% of all the White students enrolled in Harris County public schools are enrolled in HISD. Table 7 presents the number and percentage of HISD's enrollment compared to that of all 20 school districts in Harris County (including HISD). American Indian students comprise less than 0.1% of both HISD and Harris County and were combined with White students in the table.

Table 7
Number and Percentage of HISD Enrollment Compared to the Total Enrollment in All School Districts in Harris County for 1987–88

	1974–75		1888–89	
	HISD	Harris County	HISD	Harris County
Black	88,804 (78.6%)	112,940	77,828 (61.1%)	127,391
Hispanic	40,227 (71.8%)	56,004	77,701 (56.8%)	136,790
Asian	845 (51.5%)	1,641	5,129 (23.3%)	22,035
White/Am Ind	81,698 (31.7%)	257,700	29,723 (13.3%)	222,856
Total	211,574 (49.4%)	428,285	190,381 (37.4%)	509,072

Table 7 shows that in 1988–89, HISD had over 50% of both the Black and Hispanic and only 13% of the White public school population in Harris County. During 1988–89, only three other school districts in Harris County had more than 50% Black and Hispanic students combined.

The percentage of students enrolled in one-race schools in HISD is presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Percentage of Students Attending One-Race Schools, 1974–75 to 1988–89

	Elementary	Middle/Junior High	Senior High	Total
1974–75 Baseline	56.9	44.1	58.3	54.1
1975–76	54.4	34.1	52.8	49.0
1976–77	51.6	34.6	46.0	46.3
1977–78	50.9	34.8	41.2	45.0
1978–79	50.8	37.7	36.4	44.8
1979–80	48.5	39.5	43.2	45.4
1980–81	50.1	37.5	39.3	45.0
1981–82	51.7	37.8	38.0	45.5
1982–83	49.6	39.6	38.4	44.8
1983–84	49.5	44.2	45.4	47.3
1984–85	48.9	42.4	45.5	46.5
1985–86	49.8	45.8	41.0	46.8
1986–87	48.3	44.8	42.5	46.2
1987–88	48.3	40.8	42.6	45.4
1988–89	52.3	42.5	43.2	48.1

Data from Table 8 reveal that a smaller percentage of students are attending one-race schools now as compared to the 1974–75 baseline period. After a decline with the initiation of Magnet schools, the percentage of students attending one-race schools appears to be stabilizing.

Of the 125 one-race schools, all had student enrollments which were 90% or more Black and/or Hispanic students. A total of 88,781 Black and Hispanic students were enrolled in these 125 one-race minority schools during 1988–89. This total represents 57.1% of the 155,529 Black and Hispanic students enrolled in all HISD schools. This is 2.6 percent more than last year.

Objective 3: HISD will provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet schools outside their attendance zone.

The District Court decree allowing implementation of the Magnet School Plan required the district to provide free transportation to students attending a Magnet school outside their attendance zone. To determine whether the district was providing free transportation to Magnet school students, a brief questionnaire was sent to the Transportation Department to gather the following data:

1. Total number of students transported in HISD, by race;
2. Total number of Magnet students transported, by race;
3. Total number of transportation vehicles used and total number of transportation vehicles used to transport Magnet students;
4. Total number of transportation routes and runs (trips) number of routes and runs used to transport Magnet students;
5. Transportation costs per mile;
6. Approximate annual cost per student for Magnet school students and for non-Magnet school students; and
7. Total number of transportation agreements.

During the 1988–89 school year, the Transportation Department reported transporting 27,935 students (50.7% Black, 25.5% Hispanic, and 23.8% White/Other). Of the total number of students transported, 17,175 (49.7% Black, 24.7% Hispanic, and 25.6% White) were transported for desegregation purposes. This total includes majority-to-minority (M to M) transfer students who attend Magnet school campuses but who are not enrolled in the Magnet school program.

Since the Transportation Department does not separate M to M transfer students in their record keeping, it is not possible to specify precisely what proportion of Magnet school transfer students were transported. The Transportation Department indicated that every effort is made to transport all Magnet school students who apply before the June deadline. After bus routes are established in the summer, students are provided transportation as room on the bus routes is available.

The Transportation Department also utilizes transportation agreements in certain cases where bus transportation is not available. This transportation agreement allows the district to reimburse the parent/guardian for transporting his/her child to school. To be eligible, the student must meet the

state's guidelines. Only one transportation agreement is issued per parent or residence. During 1988–89, 889 transportation agreements were issued.

The Transportation Department utilized a total of 960 school buses, of which 474 were used to transport Magnet and Majority to Minority transfer students. Each operational bus has one route. At any point in time, many buses are being serviced or repaired or have been retired from operation due to their condition. The cost per mile for bus transportation for Magnet students and M to M students was $1.49. During the 1988–89 school year, the annual per pupil cost of transporting Magnet and M to M transfer students was $550.00 per student as compared to $107.78 per regular student and $1,238.64 per special education student. These costs are based on the total miles traveled for the year.

The greater cost per student for Magnet school transportation provides an additional indication of the district's commitment to provide transportation to as many Magnet students as possible.

Objective 4: HISD will report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet school biannually.

The district provides student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group as part of the annual report presented to the Equity/Quality Assurance Committee, the Parties to the Settlement Agreement, and the public. Student enrollment in Magnet programs is presented in this report.

Magnet ethnic enrollment goals are not the same for all programs. Magnet schools are divided geographically into two groups: In-Town Consortium and Satellite. The borders for the In-Town Consortium Schools are Loop 610 on the west and south, Highway 288 on the east and Buffalo Bayou on the north. All other Magnet schools are designated Satellite schools.

In-Town Consortium Schools had the goal of 50% minority and 50% White for 1984–85. As a result of the Settlement Agreement, beginning with the 1985–86 school year, the ethnic goal for In-Town Consortium Schools was 60% minority and 40% White for the incoming grades, adding an additional grade each year. The district's ethnic goals are different for each group of schools. Satellite Magnet schools have the ethnic goal of 35% white and 65% minority.

Within the minority ratio for all Magnet schools, neither minority group is to exceed the districtwide percentage of representation for that race or ethnicity as calculated in the previous year's official enrollment, that is, during 1988–89, the participation rate for Black students was not to exceed 41.8%, and the participation rate for Hispanic students was not to exceed 38.9%.

Ethnic ratios are allowed to fluctuate to 65% White/Other and 35% Minority after July 1, based on student interest in the program. Ten percent of the vacancies must remain available.

Student enrollment in Magnet schools is summarized in the following five tables (9–13). These data represent actual student enrollment in May 1989, as reported by Magnet coordinators in their final audits.

Table 9
Final Student Enrollment for Add-On (AOP) Magnet Programs, May 1989

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	
ELEMENTARY								
Bell	231	34.4	101	15.1	49.5	339	50.5	671
Berry	194	21.1	677	73.7	94.8	48	5.2	919
Bruce	313	73.8	77	18.2	92.0	34	8.0	424
Codwell	471	88.4	2	0.4	88.7	60	11.3	533
Elrod	541	66.5	87	10.7	77.1	186	22.9	814
Garden Villas	359	42.3	207	24.4	66.7	283	33.3	849
* Horn	121	23.3	90	17.3	40.6	309	59.4	520
Law	462	97.9	9	1.9	99.8	1	0.2	472
Lockhart	604	92.9	9	1.4	94.3	37	5.7	650
* Longfellow	257	46.2	87	15.6	61.9	212	38.1	556
Lovett	223	40.2	54	9.7	49.9	278	50.1	555
* MacGregor	302	63.8	102	21.6	85.4	69	14.6	473
* Poe	136	18.7	231	31.8	50.6	359	49.4	726
Pugh	6	0.8	720	92.4	93.2	53	6.8	779
* Roberts	156	31.0	133	26.4	57.5	214	42.5	503
* Rogers, W	213	42.1	153	30.2	72.3	140	27.7	506
* West University	139	12.8	90	8.3	21.0	861	79.0	1,090
Subtotal	4,728	42.8	2,829	25.6	68.5	3483	31.5	11,040
MIDDLE								
Clifton	404	30.6	459	34.7	65.3	458	34.7	1,321
Revere	297	17.3	613	35.8	53.2	802	46.8	1,712
Subtotal	701	23.1	1,072	35.3	58.5	1260	41.5	3033
SENIOR								
Reagan	288	18.1	1,076	67.5	85.6	230	14.4	1,594
Total Add-On	5,717	36.5	4,977	31.8	68.3	4973	31.7	15,667

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools — 60% Minority/40% White
Satellite Magnet Schools — 65% Minority/35% White

Table 10
Final Student Enrollment for School-Within-a-School (SWAS)
Magnet Programs, May 1989

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N
ELEMENTARY								
Askew	46	17.6	25	9.5	27.1	191	72.9	262
Burbank	61	34.3	55	30.9	65.2	62	34.8	178
Burrus	141	79.7	29	16.4	96.0	7	4.0	177
Cornelius	88	32.6	72	26.7	59.3	110	40.7	270
DeZavala	5	8.2	52	85.2	93.4	4	6.6	61
* Dodson	71	32.3	60	27.3	59.5	89	40.5	220
Dow	54	44.3	34	27.9	72.1	34	27.9	122
Durham	108	52.9	31	15.2	68.1	65	31.9	204
Herod	39	21.3	23	12.6	33.9	121	66.1	183
Jones, A	35	29.7	55	46.6	76.3	28	23.7	118
* Jones, JW	75	43.1	29	16.7	59.8	70	40.2	174
Kolter	124	42.3	58	19.8	62.1	111	37.9	293
Lantrip	35	30.7	41	36.0	66.7	38	33.3	114
Lockhart	82	68.3	7	5.8	74.2	31	25.8	120
Lovett	128	49.0	45	17.2	66.3	88	33.7	261
* MacGregor	50	50.0	0	0.0	50.0	50	50.0	100
Oak Forest	72	37.5	52	27.1	64.6	68	35.4	192
Parker	157	44.5	73	20.7	65.2	123	34.8	353
Pleasantville	86	38.4	35	15.6	54.0	103	46.0	224
Red	62	60.2	4	3.9	64.1	37	35.9	103
* River Oaks	153	29.4	116	22.3	51.6	252	48.4	521
* Roberts	61	41.5	17	11.6	53.1	69	46.9	147
Rogers, TH	103	23.5	58	13.2	36.7	278	63.3	439
* Rogers, W	152	57.8	25	9.5	67.3	86	32.7	263
Roosevelt	45	31.7	41	28.9	60.6	56	39.4	142
Ross	90	66.7	28	20.7	87.4	17	12.6	135
Scroggins	42	24.0	72	41.1	65.1	61	34.9	175
Travis	13	14.6	34	38.2	52.8	42	47.2	89
* Twain	70	40.0	33	18.9	58.9	72	41.1	175
Wainwright	57	32.0	56	31.5	63.5	65	36.5	178
* Whidby	50	40.7	14	11.4	52.0	59	48.0	123
* Wilson	44	28.8	44	28.8	57.5	65	42.5	153
Windsor Village	108	40.8	20	7.5	48.3	137	51.7	265
Subtotal	2,507	38.4	1,338	20.5	58.8	2,689	41.2	6,534
MIDDLE								
Burbank	83	30.7	98	36.3	67.0	89	33.0	270
Clifton	119	30.1	120	30.4	60.5	156	39.5	396
Fleming	155	56.8	82	30.0	86.8	36	13.2	273

Table 10 Cont'd.

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total	Goal
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N	N
Fondren	86	34.4	56	22.4	56.8	108	43.2	250	300
* Gregory-Lincoln	86	33.2	76	29.3	62.5	97	37.5	259	250
Hamilton	87	34.0	99	38.7	72.7	70	27.3	256	275
Hartman	111	40.8	92	33.8	74.6	69	25.4	272	300
Holland	53	36.3	45	30.8	67.1	48	32.9	146	150
Johnston	271	46.2	106	18.1	64.3	209	35.7	586	600
* Lanier	200	30.1	125	18.8	48.9	339	51.1	664	725
* Pershing	191	43.0	73	16.4	59.5	180	40.5	444	425
Ryan	135	77.1	27	15.4	92.6	13	7.4	175	175
Welch	127	42.2	65	21.6	63.8	109	36.2	301	300
Subtotal	1,704	39.7	1,064	24.8	64.5	1,523	35.5	4,291	
SENIOR									
Austin	34	22.7	105	70.0	92.7	11	7.3	150	200
Bellaire	86	17.4	108	21.9	39.4	299	60.6	493	600
Davis	32	24.1	86	64.7	88.7	15	11.3	133	250
Jones	120	53.3	24	10.7	64.0	81	36.0	225	300
* Lamar	263	43.8	76	12.6	56.4	262	43.6	601	600
Milby	36	11.0	217	66.4	77.4	74	22.6	327	350
Reagan	99	31.3	138	43.7	75.0	79	25.0	316	300
Sterling	23	17.3	33	24.8	42.1	77	57.9	133	160
Washington	253	68.9	49	13.4	82.3	65	17.7	367	500
Yates	238	84.1	12	4.2	88.3	33	11.7	283	300
Subtotal	1,184	39.1	848	28.0	67.2	996	32.9	3,028	
Total SWAS	5,395	39.0	3,250	23.5	62.4	5,208	37.6	13,853	

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools: 60% Minority/40% White
Satellite Magnet Schools: 65% Minority/35% White

Table 11
Final Student Enrollment for Separate and Unique (SUS) Magnet Schools, May 1989

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N
MIDDLE								
* Contemporary Lrng Ctr	108	82.4	12	9.2	91.6	11	8.4	131
SENIOR								
* Contemporary Lrng Ctr	324	80.8	50	12.5	93.3	27	6.7	401
* Foley's Academy	33	29.2	34	30.1	59.3	46	40.7	113
* Health Professions	356	50.1	114	16.0	66.1	241	33.9	711
Jordan	1,005	79.7	237	18.8	98.5	19	1.5	1,261
Law Enforcement	244	38.1	244	38.1	76.3	152	23.8	640
* Performing & Vsl Arts	85	14.3	79	13.3	27.6	430	72.4	594
Subtotal	2,047	55.0	758	20.4	75.4	915	24.6	3,720
Total SUS	2,155	56.0	770	20.0	76.0	926	24.0	3,851

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools: 60% Minority/40% White
Satellite Magnet Schools: 65% Minority/35% White

Table 12
Final Student Participation for Cluster Center Magnet Programs, May 1989

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	Served
Career World	928	29.2	1,176	36.9	66.1	1,079	33.9	3,183
Children's Literature	1,861	35.7	1,631	31.3	67.0	1,717	33.0	5,209
International Trade	885	28.8	1,012	32.9	61.7	1,176	38.3	3,073
Outdoor Ed – Cullen	941	38.6	812	33.3	71.9	686	28.1	2,439
Outdoor Ed – Olympia	1,748	37.4	1,600	34.2	71.6	1,330	28.4	4,678
People Place	3,220	38.6	2,858	34.2	72.8	2,270	27.2	8,348
Wildlife Discovery	778	35.9	837	38.6	74.5	553	25.5	2,168
Total Cluster	10,361	35.6	9,926	34.1	69.7	8,811	30.3	29,098

Table 13
Final Student Enrollment* in All Magnet Programs, May 1989

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	Participation
Elementary	6,762	40.5	4,073	24.4	64.9	5,848	35.1	16,683
Middle	2,394	33.9	2,028	28.7	62.6	2,638	37.4	7,060
Senior	3,420	42.6	2,544	31.7	74.4	2,062	25.7	8,026
Subtotal	12,576	39.6	8,645	27.2	66.8	10,548	33.2	31,769
Cluster Centers	10,361	33.8	9,926	32.4	66.3	8,811	33.8	29,098
Grand Total	22,937	37.7	18,571	30.5	68.2	19,359	31.8	60,867

* Adjusted so that a student enrolled in a Magnet School with an AOP and SWAS program is not counted twice.

District Ethnic Goals Across All Magnet Programs

The data reported in Tables 9 through 13 suggest that, taken as a whole, the several categories of Magnet school programs were successful in attracting students from the district's three ethnic groups. Transfer students leave their home schools to transfer to Magnet schools or they participate in their home school's school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet program. Of the 21,586 Magnet school transfer students reported in the May 15, 1989 Student Transfer Report, 9,073 students (42.0%) were Black, 5,430 students (25.2%) were Hispanic, and 7,083 students (32.8%) were White. The combined Black and Hispanic enrollment was 67.2%. The total number of Magnet transfer students includes 1,643 VIEP (Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan) students who do not reside in HISD but transfer into HISD as part of this plan. Of the 1,643 VIEP transfer students, 804, or 48.9%, were White.

A total of 31,769 students were enrolled as full time students in Magnet schools. Of these, 12,576 (39.6%) were Black students, 8,645 (27.2%) were Hispanic students and 10,548 (33.2%) were White students. The total percentage of minority students (Black and Hispanic combined) was 66.8%.

In addition to the 31,769 full time Magnet students, 29,098 students participated in Cluster Center Magnet programs. Examples of the content taught in cluster centers include international trade, children's literature, career awareness, multicultural awareness, outdoor education/ecology and wildlife. In theory, students from racially isolated schools attend classes for 3, 4, or 5 days in the cluster centers, which are comprised of students representing the three races and ethnicities in the district. Cluster centers ask schools to send a specific number of students in each race or ethnic group. Schools select students to participate by sending a whole class or by sending representatives from the

different classes in the school. In some instances, when representatives are selected, the students have the responsibility of reporting their experience back to the class. Most coordinators are not directly involved in the selection of students for participation and are therefore unable to control the exact percentages in which each race or ethnic group participates in the cluster center.

Campuses on which Magnet schools are located receive several benefits from the Magnet School Program. Pupil/teacher ratios on secondary campuses are lowered to 26:1 in academic classes and 21:1 in specialty classes. Additional curriculum specialists and support personnel are assigned to Magnet school campuses, and funds for additional material and supplies are allotted. Students who attend school on a campus which also houses a Magnet school share in these benefits. A total of 44,068 non-Magnet students received these indirect Magnet school benefits this year.

The education of a total of 104,935 students was impacted both directly and indirectly by HISD's Magnet School Program. These students represented 55.1% of the district's total enrollment. These data, together with data related to individual Magnet schools, indicate that the Magnet School Program was successful in attracting and serving a multi-ethnic student population.

Enrollment and Ethnic Goals for Individual Magnet Programs

School-Within-a-School Magnet Programs

Of the 33 elementary and 23 secondary school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs, 29 elementary and 10 secondary programs were within 5% of the total enrollment goal for their program. These schools are listed in Table 14.

Table 14
SWAS Magnet Programs That Met Their Total Enrollment Goals, May 1989

Elementary Schools		Secondary Schools
Askew El.	Red El.	Burbank Middle
Burbank El.	River Oaks El. *	Clifton Middle
Cornelius El.	Roberts El. *	Gregory-Lincoln Middle *
Dodson El. *	Rogers, TH El.	Holland Middle
Dow El.	Rogers, W El. *	Johnston Middle
Durham El.	Roosevelt El.	Pershing Middle *
Jones, A El.	Ross El.	Ryan Middle
Jones, JW El. *	Scroggins El.	Welch Middle
Kolter El.	Travis El.	Lamar High *
Lantrip El.	Twain El. *	Reagan High
Lockhart El.	Wainwright El.	
Lovett El.	Whidby El. *	
MacGregor El.	Wilson El. *	
Oak Forest El.	Windsor Village El.	
Parker El.		

* In-Town Consortium School

One-race campuses that have a school-within-a-school Magnet program operate under special transfer considerations. On a one-race campus, transfer policy allows the transfer of students in an ethnic group that would integrate the campus to be increased to 10% of the school's total enrollment. Magnet minority percentages are adjusted downward proportionately.

Of the 33 elementary and 23 secondary school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs, 15 elementary and 9 secondary programs were within ±5% of the district's ethnic goals of 35% White/65% minority for Satellite schools and 40% White/60% minority for In-Town Consortium Schools. Of these 24 SWAS campuses that were within ±5% of the district's ethnic goals, 8 elementary and 5 secondary Magnet programs did not exceed the prescribed ceilings of 41.8% Black and 38.9% Hispanic. All 24 schools are listed below in Table 15.

Table 15
SWAS Magnet Programs That Were ±5% of the Ethnic and Racial Goals, May 1989

Did Not Exceed Black or Hispanic Percentage Ceiling	Did Exceed Black or Hispanic Percentage Ceiling
Burbank El.	Durham El.
Dodson El.	Jones, JW El. *
Lantrip El.	Kolter El.
Oak Forest El.	Lovett El.
Roosevelt El.	Parker El.
Twain El. *	Red El.
Wainwright El.	Scroggins El.
Wilson El. *	Johnston Middle
Burbank Middle	Pershing Middle *
Clifton Middle	Welch Middle
Gregory-Lincoln Middle *	Jones High
Holland Middle	
Lamar High *	

* In-Town Consortium School

Several schools have been allowed to increase the White enrollment over the prescribed percentage in order to bring the school out of the one-race school category. Those which have been successful are Dodson Elementary, MacGregor Elementary and Whidby Elementary.

Add-On-Programs and Separate and Unique School Magnets

An add-on-program (AOP) is one where the Magnet specialty is added to the regular school curriculum. The students impacted on these campuses comprise the total enrollment of the school. A separate and unique Magnet provides a unique curriculum and single educational focus for all students in the school. All students in a separate and unique Magnet school are transfer students; there is no zoned home school population.

Magnet school transfer policy for 100% Magnet schools states, "The goal at each school with an add-on program or which is a separate and unique school is to achieve the most integration possible." Further, the following paragraph of the Magnet school transfer policy states, "Most Add-on Programs and Separate and Unique schools add the goal of decreasing the number of one-race schools. Some . . . are designed primarily to help stabilize a school's integrated enrollment." These two goals can be measured.

In order to measure "the most integration possible," the 1988–89 ethnic percentages of add-on and separate and unique programs were compared to the previous year's ethnic percentages. If a Magnet

program maintained its previous year's ethnic percentages or moved closer to the district's racial and ethnic goal for In-Town Consortium and Satellite schools, the program was said to have met its recruitment goal.

Of the twenty AOP Magnet schools, five elementary schools were classified as one-race schools in 1988–89, based on May enrollment figures. The five schools were, Berry, Bruce, Law, Lockhart, and Pugh. These same five AOP Magnet schools were one-race schools in 1987–88. Eleven Magnet add-on programs that maintained or improved their ethnic ratios were Bell El., Berry El., Elrod El., Garden Villas El., Law El., MacGregor El., Poe El., Pugh El., West University El., Clifton Middle, and Revere Middle. Because of a lack of specificity in the court order, even schools with very little or no integration are considered to have met their ethnic goal if the percentages are maintained. The percentages of White enrollment for May 1988 and May 1989 are presented for all AOP Magnet schools in Table 16.

Table 16
Percentages of White Enrollment at AOP Magnet Schools, May 1988 and May 1989

AOP/Total Magnets	May 1988	May 1989	% Change
Bell	60	51	–9
Berry	5	5	0
Bruce	9	8	–1
Codwell	15	11	–4
Elrod	21	23	+2
Garden Villas	33	33	0
Horn *	58	59	+1
Law	<1	<1	0
Longfellow *	39	38	–1
Lovett	48	50	+2
MacGregor *	15	15	0
Poe *	52	49	–3
Pugh	7	7	0
Roberts *	40	43	+3
Rogers, W*	31	28	–3
West University *	79	79	0
Clifton	34	35	+1
Revere	51	47	–4
Reagan	17	14	–3

* In-Town Consortium School

Of the seven separate and unique (SUS) Magnet schools, three (CLC Middle, CLC Senior, and Jordan) are classified as one-race minority schools. Three high schools maintained or improved their ethnic

ratios: Foley's Academy, Jordan, and Performing and Visual Arts. Table 17 lists all SUS Magnet schools with their percentage of White enrollment for the past two years.

Table 17
Percentages of White Enrollment at Separate and Unique Magnet Schools
in May 1988 and May 1989

Separate and Unique	% White Enrollment		
	May 1988	May 1989	% Change
CLC Middle *	10	8	−2
CLC Senior *	15	7	−8
Foley's Academy *	33	41	+8
Health Professions *	35	34	−1
Law Enforcement	27	24	−3
Jordan	2	2	0
Perform & Visual Arts*	73	72	−1

* In-Town Consortium School

Of the 27 add-on and separate and unique programs, 14 met the goal of maintaining or improving ethnic percentages.

INFORMATION REQUIRED BY THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Settlement Agreement requires that the following information be provided in this report: ". . . per pupil expenditures, race or ethnicity, achievement scores, average class size, student/teacher ratios, teacher experience and waiting lists for each magnet program and location."

Race or ethnicity enrollment by Magnet program is presented in Tables 9–13. Table 18 provides data on student/teacher ratio and teacher experience. Average class size, per pupil expenditure, waiting lists and student/professional staff ratio were not available this year.

The student/teacher ratio is the average number of students per classroom teacher at each school excluding special education classes. This information was obtained from the *1988–89 District and School Profiles*. Teacher experience is based upon the number of years of experience in HISD as well as in other districts.

Table 18
Student/Teacher Ratio and Teacher Experience by Magnet School, 1988–89

		Teachers' Years Experience (%)		
	Stud/Tea Ratio	1–3	4–10	11+
ELEMENTARY				
Askew (SWAS)	22.9	23	29	48
Bell (AOP)	21.2	15	33	51
Berry (AOP)	21.5	32	31	37
Bruce (AOP)	22.2	24	39	36
Burbank (SWAS)	23.3	24	33	43
Burrus (SWAS)	22.0	18	29	53
Codwell (AOP)	19.5	39	27	34
Cornelius (SWAS)	20.3	33	20	47
DeZavala (SWAS)	22.3	30	37	33
Dodson (SWAS)	22.3	24	29	47
Dow (SWAS)	22.1	33	33	33
Durham (SWAS)	21.5	21	50	29
Elrod (AOP)	18.7	44	30	26
Garden Villas (AOP)	23.2	22	24	54
Herod (SWAS)	19.8	30	27	42
Horn (AOP)	22.3	10	27	63
Jones, A (SWAS)	21.1	38	27	35
Jones, JW (SWAS)	22.7	45	23	32
Kolter (SWAS)	22.2	18	44	38
Lantrip (SWAS)	22.6	42	21	37
Law (AOP)	20.1	35	19	45

Table 18 Cont'd.

		Stud/Tea Ratio	Teachers' Years Experience (%) 1–3	4–10	11+
	Lockhart (AOP & SWAS)	21.1	28	25	48
	Longfellow (AOP)	19.9	47	15	38
	Lovett (AOP & SWAS)	20.7	18	30	52
	MacGregor (AOP & SWAS)	18.3	33	9	58
	Oak Forest (SWAS)	21.9	16	18	66
	Parker (SWAS)	22.7	8	29	63
	Pleasantville (SWAS)	19.8	23	42	35
	Poe (SWAS)	18.9	26	15	60
	Pugh (AOP)	20.7	50	22	28
	Red (SWAS)	20.5	17	25	58
	River Oaks (SWAS)	19.8	20	30	50
	Roberts (AOP & SWAS)	18.9	24	38	38
	Rogers, TH (SWAS)	NA	28	37	35
	Rogers, W (AOP & SWAS)	19.1	28	25	47
	Roosevelt (SWAS)	23.1	23	36	41
	Ross (SWAS)	20.5	18	18	64
	Scroggins (SWAS)	19.5	27	41	32
	Travis (SWAS)	21.8	33	27	40
	Twain (SWAS)	19.9	54	21	25
	Wainwright (SWAS)	20.4	9	40	51
	West University (AOP)	21.0	28	34	38
	Whidby (SWAS)	22.3	33	13	53
	Wilson (SWAS)	23.9	22	26	52
	Windsor Village (SWAS)	22.8	18	34	47
MIDDLE					
	Burbank (SWAS)	20.5	24	33	42
	CLC (SUS)	19.8	10	60	30
	Clifton (AOP & SWAS)	20.2	22	21	57
	Fleming (SWAS)	16.4	18	36	47
	Fondren (SWAS)	20.5	32	28	40
	Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS)	14.7	35	41	24
	Hamilton (SWAS)	19.8	24	26	50
	Hartman (SWAS)	20.5	32	23	45
	Holland (SWAS)	18.3	19	30	51
	Johnston (SWAS)	19.1	21	30	49
	Lanier (SWAS)	19.0	31	22	46
	Pershing (SWAS)	20.6	11	34	55
	Revere (AOP)	21.0	15	36	49
	Ryan (SWAS)	16.6	9	28	62
	Welch (SWAS)	20.0	9	24	68
SENIOR					
	Austin (SWAS)	20.7	19	31	49
	Bellaire (SWAS)	22.1	18	22	60
	CLC (SUS)	16.7	24	10	66

Table 18 Cont'd.

	Stud/Tea Ratio	Teachers' Years Experience (%) 1–3	4–10	11+
Davis (SWAS)	17.2	29	29	41
Foley's Academy (SUS)	12.1	25	25	50
Health Professions (SUS)	15.1	4	31	65
Jones (SWAS)	17.3	27	20	53
Jordan (SUS)	16.4	21	29	51
Lamar (SWAS)	20.9	17	34	49
Law Enforcement (SUS)	15.5	25	39	36
Milby (SWAS)	19.9	23	27	51
Performing and Visual Arts (SUS)	17.0	13	26	61
Reagan (AOP & SWAS)	19.0	18	28	54
Sterling (SWAS)	20.0	12	19	70
Washington (SWAS)	19.5	11	26	63
Yates (SWAS)	19.3	10	27	63

* In-Town Consortium School

Tables 19 presents, by Magnet school or location, the number of verbal enrollment denials made by Magnet campus personnel. A verbal denial is a response that the Magnet program is at goal or capacity. This response is made by Magnet school personnel to inquiries about the program. Some campuses allow any interested parent to complete an application even if the program is at capacity and do not verbally deny enrollment. Ethnic breakdowns for verbal denials should be interpreted with caution as the classifications made by coordinators are often based on telephone conversations.

Because a student may contact any number of Magnet schools, a student may be represented in this table more than once. The number of unduplicated students who received verbal denials cannot be determined.

Table 19
The Number of Verbal Denials In-District (HISD)
and Out-of-District (non-HISD) by Race and Ethnicity, 1988–89

	Black		Hispanic		White/Other		Total		Total
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	
ELEMENTARY									
Askew (SWAS)	3	0	0	0	22	15	25	15	40
Kate Bell (AOP)	26	6	15	0	23	4	64	10	74
Berry (AOP)	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Bruce (AOP)	8	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	9
Burbank (SWAS)	7	10	26	0	0	0	33	10	43
Burrus (SWAS)	25	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	25

Table 19 Cont'd.

	Black		Hispanic		White/Other		Total		Total
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	
Codwell (AOP)	23	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	23
Cornelius (SWAS)	24	4	17	2	16	0	57	6	63
Dezavala (SWAS)	0	0	2	0	8	0	10	0	10
Dodson (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dow (SWAS)	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	5	5
Durham (SWAS)	6	5	1	0	3	1	10	6	16
Elrod (AOP)	20	0	6	0	10	0	36	0	36
Garden Villas (AOP)	104	0	59	0	35	5	198	5	203
Herod (SWAS)	0	0	0	1	20	0	20	1	21
Horn (AOP) *	25	5	5	0	36	2	66	7	73
Jones, A (SWAS)	0	1	3	0	0	0	3	1	4
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	25	7	2	1	0	0	27	8	35
Kolter (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lantrip (SWAS)	3	2	29	0	4	0	36	2	38
Law (AOP)	13	1	2	0	0	0	15	1	16
Lockhart (AOP & SWAS)	89	20	0	8	0	2	89	30	119
Longfellow (AOP) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lovett (AOP & SWAS)	81	11	9	0	118	13	208	24	232
MacGregor (AOP & SWAS) *	10	0	3	0	0	0	13	0	13
Oak Forest (SWAS)	13	2	9	0	31	4	53	6	59
Parker (SWAS)	18	5	7	0	34	6	59	11	70
Pleasantville (SWAS)	3	0	0	0	6	0	9	0	9
Poe (AOP) *	0	0	0	0	47	0	47	0	47
Pugh (AOP)	9	0	0	0	6	0	15	0	15
Red (SWAS)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
River Oaks (SWAS) *	64	11	33	0	54	8	151	19	170
Roberts (AOP & SWAS) *	27	13	9	0	35	12	71	25	96
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	3	4	4	0	12	8	19	12	31
Rogers, W (AOP & SWAS) *	52	46	34	0	0	0	86	46	132
Roosevelt (SWAS)	6	15	10	7	7	4	23	26	49
Ross (SWAS)	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	4	4
Scroggins (SWAS)	0	1	5	0	0	0	5	1	6
Travis (SWAS)	6	0	14	0	13	0	33	0	33
Twain (SWAS) *	10	6	0	0	15	0	25	6	31
Wainwright (SWAS)	7	4	1	0	19	2	27	6	33
West University (AOP) *	27	18	10	0	121	23	158	41	199
Whidby (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wilson (SWAS) *	44	2	27	0	42	2	113	4	117
Windsor Village (SWAS)	12	9	3	0	18	8	33	17	50
Elementary Subtotal	793	219	346	22	755	121	1894	362	2256

Table 19 Cont'd.

	Black		Hispanic		White/Other		Total		Total
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	
MIDDLE									
Burbank (SWAS)	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3
Clifton (AOP & SWAS)	5	6	11	0	3	2	19	8	27
Fleming (SWAS)	8	2	13	0	2	0	23	2	25
Fondren (SWAS)	16	0	0	0	36	0	52	0	52
Gregory-Linc (SWAS) *	3	0	4	0	2	0	9	0	9
Hamilton (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hartman (SWAS)	3	0	2	0	1	0	6	0	6
Holland (AOP)	12	5	10	0	0	0	22	5	27
Johnston (SWAS)	66	4	5	0	95	18	166	22	188
Lanier (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	9	13	9	13	22
Pershing (SWAS) *	19	1	5	0	8	0	32	1	33
Revere (AOP)	0	0	0	0	16	0	16	0	16
Ryan (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welch (SWAS)	52	8	7	2	63	3	122	13	135
Middle Subtotal	184	27	57	3	235	37	476	67	543
SENIOR									
Austin (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellaire (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CLC MS and HS (SUS) *	4	13	3	3	0	2	7	18	25
Davis (SWAS)	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
Foley's Academy (SUS) *	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Health Professions (SUS) *	5	9	6	8	0	3	11	20	31
Jones (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jordan (SUS)	14	5	9	0	0	0	23	5	28
Lamar (SWAS) *	43	4	18	2	29	7	90	13	103
Law Enforcement (SUS)	5	2	0	1	1	0	6	3	9
Milby (SWAS)	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	3
Performing and Visual Arts (SUS) *	0	10	0	18	4	50	4	78	82
Reagan (AOP & SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sterling (SWAS)	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	2
Washington (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yates (SWAS)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Senior Subtotal	72	46	37	34	34	63	143	143	286
Grand Total	1049	292	440	59	1024	221	2513	572	3085

* In-Town Consortium School

Table 20 presents achievement data for elementary and middle Magnet school students on t Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6). The scores presented are the reading total a math total median grade equivalent (GE) scores. The first digit of a GE score represents the gra level and the second digit represents the month within the grade. The national average gra equivalent score is the grade level plus .7 (seven tenths).

Table 20
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)
Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests
by Magnet Program, Spring 1989

	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg M
Askew (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	◊	6.8	7.3	7.9	10.5	10.8	11.8	◊
Bell (AOP)	1.9	2.0	3.0	3.7	4.2	4.9	6.9	6.9	7.1	10.4	◊
Berry (AOP)	2.0	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.9	4.0	3.3	4.7	4.4	5.5	◊
Bruce (AOP)	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.5	2.8	3.5	3.6	4.2	4.3	5.4	6.0
Burbank (SWAS)	1.8	1.8	2.5	2.6	3.2	3.7	4.9	4.8	6.0	6.5	◊
Burrus (SWAS)	1.8	2.1	2.6	3.0	3.7	3.6	4.2	4.7	5.8	6.1	◊
Codwell (AOP)	2.6	2.8	4.6	3.5	3.6	4.6	5.9	5.8	7.2	9.9	◊
Cornelius (SWAS)	2.0	2.1	3.9	3.3	4.4	5.3	6.8	6.3	7.2	8.1	◊
DeZavala (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	◊	5.1	4.9	6.1	8.2	7.0	8.9	◊
Dodson (SWAS) *	2.1	2.1	3.1	3.2	6.0	5.5	6.9	6.7	7.2	7.4	◊
Dow (SWAS)	1.4	1.7	2.3	2.5	3.6	3.5	5.1	5.4	5.1	6.9	◊
Durham (SWAS)	2.0	2.1	3.6	3.2	4.6	4.5	6.1	6.4	7.0	7.6	◊
Elrod (AOP)	1.5	1.7	2.5	3.0	3.0	4.3	4.6	5.3	5.8	5.9	◊
Garden Villas (AOP)	1.7	2.1	2.9	3.2	4.4	4.5	4.9	5.5	5.7	7.5	◊
Herod (SWAS)	3.8	3.5	5.2	5.5	6.3	6.8	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊
Horn (AOP) *	2.1	2.4	3.6	3.4	4.6	5.2	6.0	5.9	8.2	7.6	◊
Jones, A (SWAS)	1.6	2.6	2.8	3.6	3.1	4.6	5.2	5.2	5.5	7.3	6.1
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	1.9	2.1	3.3	3.6	3.7	6.1	5.2	5.3	5.8	7.4	◊
Kolter (SWAS)	2.0	2.4	3.9	3.7	5.4	5.6	7.0	6.5	7.8	7.6	◊
Lantrip (SWAS)	2.0	1.9	3.7	3.4	4.8	4.9	6.4	6.7	7.7	8.5	◊
Law (AOP)	2.1	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.1	4.3	4.6	5.5	5.3	6.5	◊
Lockhart (AOP)	1.8	2.1	2.5	2.9	3.2	4.2	4.9	5.6	5.8	6.2	◊
Lockhart (SWAS)	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.0	4.9	4.8	5.4	5.8	5.5	6.5	◊
Longfellow (AOP) *	2.0	2.4	3.5	3.5	4.2	4.3	5.2	5.3	6.1	6.6	◊
Lovett (AOP)	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.5	5.2	4.8	7.7	7.7	8.1	8.3	◊
Lovett (SWAS)	2.6	2.8	3.1	3.4	5.1	4.7	7.7	7.7	8.6	8.3	◊
MacGregor (AOP) *	1.7	1.9	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.7	5.4	5.2	5.1	5.8	◊
MacGregor (SWAS) *	2.3	2.5	3.9	3.8	4.5	4.5	6.1	5.9	6.8	6.4	◊
Oak Forest (SWAS)	2.9	2.7	4.8	4.4	6.7	5.1	8.0	7.7	10.4	8.1	◊
Parker (SWAS)	2.0	2.4	3.6	3.5	4.2	4.9	6.7	6.5	7.6	8.9	◊
Pleasantville (SWAS)	2.6	2.8	3.9	4.1	5.4	4.7	7.7	7.7	8.0	8.5	12.7
Poe (AOP) *	1.8	2.3	3.4	3.5	4.9	4.5	6.8	6.3	8.0	8.1	◊
Pugh (AOP)	1.6	1.9	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.6	4.1	5.0	4.8	6.6	◊

Table 20 Cont'd.

	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Red (SWAS)	2.0	2.5	4.1	3.9	5.7	5.9	5.8	7.1	11.2	13.0	◊	◊
River Oaks (SWAS) *	2.4	2.7	4.8	4.8	7.0	5.9	10.7	9.7	13.0	12.7	◊	◊
Roberts (AOP) *	1.8	2.1	3.6	3.8	5.7	5.4	5.8	6.3	7.0	8.3	◊	◊
Roberts (SWAS) *	1.8	2.2	3.5	3.6	6.3	5.4	7.1	7.0	8.0	9.3	◊	◊
Rogers, T H (SWAS)	3.7	3.5	6.1	5.2	7.2	6.2	10.7	11.3	12.6	10.8	◊	◊
Rogers, W (AOP) *	2.0	2.3	3.3	3.5	3.5	4.3	5.7	5.5	6.0	7.6	◊	◊
Rogers, W (SWAS) *	1.9	2.1	3.5	3.5	4.1	4.3	5.9	5.4	6.8	8.2	◊	◊
Roosevelt (SWAS)	3.6	2.5	4.8	5.3	7.5	7.3	9.6	10.9	10.0	12.8	◊	◊
Ross (SWAS)	2.0	2.7	3.0	4.1	3.6	4.9	6.8	7.9	5.8	7.7	◊	◊
Scroggins (SWAS)	1.7	2.1	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.5	5.7	5.8	6.2	6.9	◊	◊
Travis (SWAS)	2.8	2.6	4.6	3.6	5.4	4.4	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊
Twain (SWAS) *	2.0	1.8	3.3	3.2	4.5	4.5	6.0	5.5	6.9	8.9	◊	◊
Wainwright (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	◊	7.0	6.8	6.8	6.7	8.1	9.9	◊	◊
West University (AOP) *	2.9	2.9	4.6	4.4	6.7	5.5	7.2	7.7	9.1	10.8	◊	◊
Whidby (SWAS) *	2.8	2.8	3.8	4.4	4.5	5.5	7.2	7.2	6.7	5.6	◊	◊
Wilson (SWAS) *	2.0	2.3	3.2	3.5	3.3	4.0	5.4	5.6	7.6	8.3	◊	◊
Windsor Village (SWAS)	3.9	3.5	5.8	4.8	8.1	9.1	8.8	9.7	10.4	11.8	◊	◊
Magnet	2.0	2.3	3.3	3.5	4.5	4.7	6.0	6.1	7.0	8.1	8.1	9.6
District	1.7	1.9	2.7	3.0	3.2	4.1	4.6	5.3	5.3	6.4	5.9	7.0

	Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Burbank (SWAS)	10.2	10.2	12.5	13.0	13.0	13.0
CLC (SUS) *	4.8	5.8	5.3	6.2	6.0	6.5
Clifton (AOP)	7.6	8.1	8.3	8.4	10.7	9.5
Clifton (SWAS)	10.2	11.8	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Fleming (SWAS)	6.0	8.1	7.0	8.9	8.8	9.4
Fondren (SWAS)	8.6	9.9	11.2	12.0	◊	◊
Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *	7.2	7.8	7.9	8.1	11.4	10.1
Hamilton (SWAS)	9.6	10.2	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Hartman (SWAS)	8.0	9.6	9.9	10.3	12.7	11.9
Holland (SWAS)	8.0	10.0	13.0	10.1	13.0	11.5
Johnston (SWAS)	9.1	10.2	10.5	10.5	13.0	13.0
Lanier (SWAS) *	12.7	12.1	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Pershing (SWAS) *	9.1	9.9	12.5	10.5	12.7	12.1
Revere (AOP)	7.0	8.2	8.1	8.6	11.4	10.8
Rogers, T H (SWAS)	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Ryan (SWAS)	7.8	8.3	9.9	8.6	11.4	10.3
Welch (SWAS)	8.0	10.8	10.5	10.8	13.0	13.0
Magnet	8.1	9.6	10.5	10.1	12.7	11.9
District	5.9	7.0	6.8	7.2	7.8	8.3

Table 20 Cont'd.

	Grade 9	
	Rdg	Math
Austin (SWAS)	12.5	11.9
Bellaire (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
CLC (SUS) *	7.2	7.5
Davis (SWAS)	9.9	10.1
Foley's Academy (SUS) *	13.0	9.2
Health Professions (SUS) *	13.0	13.0
Jones (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Jordan (SUS)	8.3	9.3
Lamar (SWAS) *	13.0	13.0
Law Enforcement (SUS)	13.0	13.0
Milby (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Performing and Visual Arts (SUS) *	13.0	13.0
Reagan (AOP)	9.1	9.9
Reagan (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Sterling (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Washington (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Yates (SWAS)	10.5	9.7
Magnet	13.0	13.0
District	8.7	9.5

◊ No Magnet students at this grade level
* In-Town Consortium School

Comparable Magnet elementary and middle school programs were combined together to compare test scores among the different groups. Six groups were formed: fine arts, math/science, extended day, vanguard, Montessori and miscellaneous. The miscellaneous group contains the Magnet programs which did not fit into the other groups. Listed below are the programs included in each specialty grouping.

FINE ARTS

Elementary		Middle
Bruce (AOP)	Parker (SWAS)	Fleming (SWAS)
Burrus (SWAS)	MacGregor (AOP) *	Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *
Garden Villas (AOP)	Poe (AOP) *	Johnston (SWAS)
Longfellow (AOP) *	Roberts (AOP) *	Pershing (SWAS) *
Lovett (AOP)	Scroggins (SWAS)	

MATH/SCIENCE

Elementary		Middle
Berry (AOP)	Pugh (AOP)	Clifton (SWAS)
Cornelius (SWAS)	Red (SWAS)	Fondren (SWAS)
Elrod (AOP)	Ross (SWAS)	Hartman (SWAS)
Lantrip (SWAS)	Wainwright (SWAS)	
Lockhart (AOP)	West University (AOP) *	
Law (AOP)		

VANGUARD

Elementary		Middle
Askew (SWAS)	River Oaks (SWAS) *	Burbank (SWAS)
DeZavala (SWAS)	Rogers, TH; Gr. 3-8 (SWAS)	Hamilton (SWAS)
Herod (SWAS)	Roosevelt (SWAS)	Holland (SWAS)
Oak Forest (SWAS)	Travis (SWAS)	Lanier (SWAS) *
Pleasantville (SWAS)	Windsor Village (SWAS)	Ryan (SWAS)

MONTESSORI

Elementary
Dodson (SWAS) *
Whidby (SWAS) *

EXTENDED DAY

Elementary	
Burbank (SWAS)	Lovett (SWAS)
Durham (SWAS)	MacGregor (SWAS) *
Dow (SWAS)	Roberts (SWAS) *
Jones, A (SWAS)	Twain (SWAS) *
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	Wilson (SWAS) *
Lockhart (SWAS)	

MISCELLANEOUS

Elementary		Middle
Bell (AOP)	Kolter (SWAS)	Clifton (AOP)
Codwell (AOP)	Roberts (AOP) *	CLC (SUS) *
Horn (AOP) *	Rogers, W (AOP) *	Revere (AOP)
		Welch (SWAS)

* In-Town Consortium School

The reading total and math total median GE scores on the MAT6 by grade level for the Magnet specialty groupings are found in Table 21.

Table 21
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)
Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests
for Specialty Groupings, Spring 1989

	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Fine Arts	1.8	2.2	3.1	3.3	4.2	4.5	5.7	5.8	6.7	7.4	7.8	9.2
Math/Science	2.0	2.3	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.5	5.7	5.8	6.3	7.4	7.8	8.5
Extended Day	2.0	2.2	3.1	3.5	3.8	4.6	6.0	5.8	6.9	8.3	6.1	7.4
Vanguard	3.3	3.1	4.9	4.6	6.3	6.0	8.1	9.7	10.4	10.8	11.1	11.5
Montessori	2.7	2.3	3.3	3.5	5.4	5.5	7.0	7.0	7.2	7.4		
Miscellaneous	2.1	2.4	3.6	3.6	4.1	4.8	6.0	5.9	7.2	8.5	7.2	8.4

	Grade 7		Grade 8	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Fine Arts	9.5	9.7	12.7	11.5
Math/Science	9.1	9.3	10.7	10.1
Vanguard	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Miscellaneous	8.3	8.6	11.4	10.5

The percent of students passing each subtest of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) tests is found in Table 22.

Table 22
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS)
Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Spring 1989

	Grade 1			Grade 3			Grade 5		
	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write
Askew (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	99	100	89	100	100	98
Bell (AOP)	84	76	88	88	83	79	95	94	95
Berry (AOP)	94	95	96	79	68	66	68	61	72
Bruce (AOP)	68	65	85	75	56	46	58	62	59
Burbank (SWAS)	82	72	75	80	69	62	77	82	91
Burrus (SWAS)	86	86	86	85	94	81	81	66	82
Codwell (AOP)	93	96	96	80	73	67	92	85	91
Cornelius (SWAS)	95	90	95	94	91	89	97	92	97
DeZavala (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 22 Cont'd.

	Grade 1			Grade 3			Grade 5		
	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write
Dodson (SWAS) *	91	94	88	96	100	60	96	100	91
Dow (SWAS)	87	78	87	76	77	77	92	85	85
Durham (SWAS)	92	90	95	100	89	82	97	91	97
Elrod (AOP)	80	62	77	83	69	59	72	76	72
Garden Villas (AOP)	89	75	88	91	90	82	88	80	81
Herod (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	98	100	0	0	0
Horn (AOP) *	97	92	95	95	93	89	92	97	91
Jones, A (SWAS)	89	78	89	88	77	88	70	70	60
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	91	91	100	89	88	82	93	90	97
Kolter (SWAS)	96	93	89	92	92	75	95	91	94
Lantrip (SWAS)	77	91	86	91	96	91	100	100	96
Law (AOP)	88	78	89	88	83	64	79	73	78
Lockhart (AOP)	87	87	89	94	84	64	82	84	92
Lockhart (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100	72	83	94	100
Longfellow (AOP) *	96	92	95	97	87	84	88	83	86
Lovett (AOP)	93	96	95	92	95	64	97	92	98
Lovett (SWAS)	95	100	95	92	94	60	100	91	98
MacGregor (AOP) *	85	75	88	75	73	55	72	77	83
MacGregor (SWAS) *	87	92	100	86	82	50	88	81	88
Oak Forest (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100	90	96	100	96
Parker (SWAS)	98	81	93	95	92	75	99	90	96
Pleasantville (SWAS)	100	97	100	100	100	95	100	100	100
Poe (AOP) *	89	78	82	82	80	63	91	92	93
Pugh (AOP)	86	78	86	77	64	66	88	67	79
Red (SWAS)	100	95	89	100	100	91	100	100	100
River Oaks (SWAS) *	97	97	96	98	96	92	100	100	99
Roberts (AOP) *	87	74	80	88	94	86	92	92	89
Roberts (SWAS) *	85	89	95	95	94	87	100	100	96
Rogers, T H (SWAS)	100	100	100	95	100	64	100	100	96
Rogers, W (AOP) *	94	92	89	95	88	73	90	84	85
Rogers, W (SWAS) *	96	92	92	94	94	82	94	94	91
Roosevelt (SWAS)	100	95	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ross (SWAS)	100	96	92	96	89	81	100	96	100
Scroggins (SWAS)	82	71	100	97	96	93	100	97	92
Travis (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	91	73	◊	◊	◊
Twain (SWAS) *	100	100	85	100	91	91	89	94	94
Wainwright (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	100	100	97	99	100	100
West University (AOP) *	99	95	97	95	99	91	98	98	98
Whidby (SWAS) *	95	91	96	100	100	89	66	84	66
Wilson (SWAS) *	85	89	89	100	88	81	79	70	78
Windsor Village (SWAS)	97	100	100	100	100	85	100	100	98
Magnet	91	85	90	90	86	76	90	87	89
District	84	73	82	82	75	65	81	75	78

Table 22 Cont'd.

	Grade 7		
	Math	Read	Write
Burbank (SWAS)	100	100	96
CLC (SUS) *	63	63	55
Clifton (AOP)	90	91	86
Clifton (SWAS)	100	100	100
Fleming (SWAS)	95	87	83
Fondren (SWAS)	100	99	99
Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *	100	98	91
Hamilton (SWAS)	100	100	99
Hartman (SWAS)	100	100	96
Holland (SWAS)	96	98	94
Johnston (SWAS)	98	98	94
Lanier (SWAS) *	100	100	98
Pershing (SWAS) *	99	99	95
Revere (AOP)	90	87	77
Rogers, T H (SWAS)	99	100	98
Ryan (SWAS)	98	100	98
Welch (SWAS)	100	96	95
Magnet	95	94	89
District	83	80	73

	Grade 9			Grade 11	
	Math	Read	Write	Math	Lang Arts
Austin (SWAS)	94	95	91	96	100
Bellaire (SWAS)	100	99	92	100	100
CLC (SUS) *	51	67	25	35	80
Davis (SWAS)	95	88	70	93	95
Foley's Academy (SUS) *	83	87	46	50	100
Health Professions (SUS) *	98	100	88	99	100
Jones (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100
Jordan (SUS)	84	82	65	87	97
Lamar (SWAS) *	100	100	100	99	100
Law Enforcement (SUS)	98	100	94	95	100
Milby (SWAS)	99	99	84	100	100
Performing & Visual Arts (SUS) *	96	99	95	99	100
Reagan (AOP)	81	81	50	81	94
Reagan (SWAS)	100	100	85	98	100
Sterling (SWAS)	100	100	92	100	100
Washington (SWAS)	99	99	87	100	99
Yates (SWAS)	87	81	52	91	99
Magnet	89	90	73	90	98
District	74	75	50	78	89

◊ No Magnet students at this grade level. * In-Town Consortium School

APPENDIX

MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAMS
1988–89

Elementary

Askew Vanguard (SWAS)
Bell Physical Development (AOP)
Berry Environmental Sciences (AOP)
Bruce Music Academy (AOP)
Burbank Extended Instructional Day (Year-Round) (SWAS)
Burrus Fine Arts Academy (SWAS)
Codwell Skills Academy (Year-Round) (AOP)
Cornelius Math/Science (SWAS)
DeZavala Vanguard (SWAS)
Dodson Montessori (SWAS)
Dow Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Durham Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Elrod Math/Science (AOP)
Garden Villas Music Academy (AOP)
Herod Vanguard (SWAS)
Horn Academy (AOP)
Jones, Anson Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Jones, J Will Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Kolter International Cultures and Communication (SWAS)
Lantrip Environmental Sciences (SWAS)
Law Math/Science (AOP)
Lockhart: 1) Technology (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Longfellow Creative and Performing Arts (AOP)
Lovett: 1) Center of Excellence (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
MacGregor: 1) Music and Science (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Oak Forest Vanguard (SWAS)
Parker Music Academy (SWAS)
Pleasantville Vanguard (SWAS)
Poe Fine Arts (AOP)
Pugh Institute of Fundamental Instruction and Technology (AOP)
Red Math/Science (SWAS)
River Oaks Vanguard (SWAS)
Roberts: 1) Fine Arts/Physical Development (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Rogers, TH Vanguard (SWAS)
Rogers, Will: 1) Educational.Enrichment Center (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Roosevelt Vanguard (SWAS)
Ross Math/Science (SWAS)
Scroggins Literature and Art Academy (SWAS)
Travis Vanguard (SWAS)
Twain Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Wainwright Math/Science (SWAS)
West University Math/Science (AOP)
Whidby Montessori (SWAS)
Wilson Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Windsor Village Vanguard (SWAS)

Middle

Burbank Vanguard (SWAS)
Clifton: 1) Middle (AOP); 2) Math/Science (SWAS)
Contemporary Learning Center (SUS)
Fleming Fine Arts (SWAS)
Fondren Math/Science (SWAS)
Gregory-Lincoln Fine Arts (SWAS)
Hamilton Vanguard (SWAS)
Hartman Math/Science (SWAS)
Holland Vanguard (SWAS)
Johnston Performing Arts (SWAS)
Lanier Vanguard (SWAS)
Pershing Foreign Language and Fine Arts (SWAS)
Revere Middle (AOP)
Rogers, TH Vanguard (SWAS)
Ryan Vanguard (SWAS)
Welch Physical Development (SWAS)

Senior

Austin Teaching Professions (SWAS)
Bellaire Foreign Language (SWAS)
Contemporary Learning Center (SUS)
Davis Hotel, Restaurant, Travel Careers (SWAS)
Foley's Academy (SUS)
Health Professions High School (SUS)
Jones Vanguard (SWAS)
Jordan Careers (SUS)
Lamar Business Administration (SWAS)
Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (SUS)
Milby Petro-Chemical Careers Institute (SWAS)
Performing & Visual Arts High School (SUS)
Reagan: 1) Computer Assisted Instruction (AOP); 2) Computer Technology (SWAS)
Sterling Aviation Sciences (SWAS)
Washington Engineering Professions (SWAS)
Yates Communications (SWAS)

Cluster Centers

People Place Center (Turner Elementary School)
Children's Literature Center (Briargrove Elementary School)
Outdoor Education Centers: 1) Olympia; 2) Cullen
International Trade Center (Port Houston Elementary School)
Career Orientation Center (Sinclair Elementary School)
Wildlife Discovery Center (Houston Zoo)